1	to
2	DR. LUCKY: We're talking about the
3	rules for the band, though.
4	MR. REILLY: No, I would not put that -
5	_
6	DR. LUCKY: You wouldn't. Okay. Would
7	you buy the receiver regulation?
8	MR. REILLY: No.
9	DR. LUCKY: Okay. And wouldn't buy the
10	geography stuff?
11	MR. REILLY: When you say, I'm buying
12	it with regard to inputting into the rules, as
13	opposed to having standards bodies, having the
14	industry collectively discuss the issues, identify
15	what, in fact, makes sense with regard to ways
16	going forward. And then the market will adjust
17	with regard to implementing or not implementing.
18	MR. LEARY: With respect to power in
19	the rural environment, maybe I'd have some
20	disagreement here. I'm not entirely convinced.
21	Give me the lower band, I'll take that over the
22	power because, you know, I can already do 300
23	square miles from a single location with existing

power in those areas where you can see your dog

running away for two days. However, in most of the

24

	world, you know, the proprem is
2	DR. LUCKY: That's a good criterion, by
3	the way.
4	MR. LEARY: It's a problem of
5	DR. LUCKY: That's a good definition of
6	rural.
7	MR. LEARY: But seriously, it's a
8	problem of foliage, not necessarily of power. And
9	also, in a data environment you have to take into
10	account the reality of latency, so we could get
11	lots of power. Okay. Fantastic, out at 60 mile
12	link, but then I've got, you know, a certain amount
13	of latency that's unavoidable because of that
14	distance, so give me the lower band. I'll take
15	that any time over the power.
16	DR. LUCKY: Okay. Over there.
17	MR. SNYDER: Two related questions.
18	Earlier when we talked about beach front spectrum,
19	and you could take Sahara Spectrum, you know, high
20	frequencies as a contrast point. Does spectrum
21	Etiquette systematically vary based on frequency?
22	We've assumed here that I think etiquette is sort
23	of homogenous, regardless of the band, but are
24	there systematic differences?
25	I, for example, think the UNII Band is

too high for a lot of valuable unlicensed
applications. Your comment would bolster that, so
that's are there any systematic differences
based on frequency? And the second question is,
let's take spectrum below 3 gigahertz and above,
could you give me a specific number as to what
percentage of that spectrum should be allocated for
unlicensed? Would it be 10 percent under 3
gigahertz, and 5 percent between 3 gigahertz and 30
gigahertz, or would it be the same spread equally?
You know, with land, 90 percent of the federal
lands is, you know, on the other side of the
Mississippi, on the western side of the
Mississippi.
Are there systematic differences as to
where this unlicensed spectrum should be allocated
because of, you know, etiquette related issues
around frequencies?
DR. LUCKY: Okay. Well, the answer to
your first question is yes, and the answer to the
second is 27 percent.
DR. NEGUS: Yeah. I'd like to re-
emphasize. Bob is correct, it is 27 percent.
DR. LUCKY: I think 27.5.
DR. NEGUS: Presumably, when you say

unlicensed, do you mean something like the ISM Band or the UNII Band, where unlicensed has a preferred home? Let me remind you, under 15.209 you can put unlicensed in most places under 40 gigahertz as long as you avoid the places that are drilled out, and as long as you stay at a very low level of -40 dBM per megahertz. But I think what you're talking about is higher powers.

DR. deVRIES: Yeah, I just want to -ves. And I think, you know, to answer your first question, or to address your first question, you know, if I think here about, you know, a place "unlicensed" special where has a home, essentially where, you know, there is no single owner of the use of that band, I think the lower you go, the more important spectrum Etiquettes or become, because it sharing rules propagates further. And so if you're up, you know, at a part of the band where it doesn't go through walls, gee, you know, do you really need it?

Well, actually in some cases if you've got thin walls, you live in an apartment, yeah, you probably do. But if you're, you know, down where it goes for miles, you absolutely need those things.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. LUCKY: Okay. I think it's time to change gears. I appreciate the specificity that we got to, even though everyone had a different proposition about what should be done, so I'll turn it back over to Mike.

Well, let's be a DR. MARCUS: Okay. little bit more explicit. Dudley talked a little bit about the antenna problems that the wireless ISP community is having, and their desire to mix and match antennas. We -- the current restriction on antennas and cabling comes with the more general Part 15 devices, which include cordless phones, remote control cars, and things like that where it really doesn't make any sense to allow people to put any antenna on it. So one question is, if we were to -- if the wireless ISP industry is having major problems with that, can they come up with any better ways of allowing other antennas, but that keeps the intent of our rule, you know, the narrow rule.

But the second question, which is a close cousin of that is, in 15.209, which I keep mentioning, which allows unlicensed virtually anywhere under 40 gigahertz, the current level of 500 microvolts per meter and -40dBM for megahertz,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	depending which units you want, currently applies
2	everywhere from 960 to 40 gigahertz. Is that the
3	right number? If it isn't the right number, how in
4	the world would we go around determining what the
5	right number is?
6	So those are two possible changes to
7	our rules that may or may not be helpful, or may or
8	may not change the balance of power. And does
9	anyone on the panel want to talk about either of
LO	those?
l <b>1</b>	MR. FREEMAN: The first part, I think
12	we should consider having the antenna manufacturers
13	just submit through a testing lab the specs of the
L <b>4</b>	specific antenna that would have the same
1.5	characteristics of the antenna that comes from the
16	specific manufacturer. Remember, the specific
L 7	manufacturer is not in the antenna business anyhow,
L 8	unless it's an integrated product.
19	DR. MARCUS: Okay. So you would have
20	the manufacturer say, or submit for approval to the
2 <b>1</b>	FCC or the whoever does the approval
22	MR. FREEMAN: Right.
23	DR. LUCKY: So I can't use a Pringle's
24	can?
25	MR. FREEMAN: No, I don't think so.

1	DR. LUCKY: I want to use the Pringle's
2	can.
3	DR. NEGUS: Pringle's can certify their
4	antenna then.
5	DR. LUCKY: Pringle's could certify
6	their can.
7	DR. MARCUS: So the specs that you, the
8	manufacturer of the transmitter, say you would
9	issue some spec, and if Pringle's met that spec
LO	DR. LUCKY: And right on the can it
l <b>1</b> .	would have a Good Housekeeping seal of approval,
12	you know, approved for use after you've eaten the
13	potato chips.
l <b>4</b>	DR. MARCUS: Yeah. Dual use
L 5	technology.
L 6	MR. FREEMAN: The other thing is the
L7	clear understanding that professional installation
L8	is required for the systems in the fixed broadband.
.9	DR. LUCKY: Oh, no.
20	MR. FREEMAN: Installation.
21	DR. LUCKY: We've got all these
22	volunteer hot spots out there.
2.3	MR. LEARY: A different network.
4	MR. FREEMAN: Different network.
5	MR. LEARY: Different network. We're

1	talking infrastructure from basically predominantly
2	tower
3	DR. MARCUS: Now if it was a turnkey
4	system that you bought in Radio Shack as a turnkey
5	system, do you think professional installation
6	would still be required, or only if you buy your
7	own antenna?
8	MR. FREEMAN: Well, I think
9	professional installation for the what we do as
10	a last mile provider, or a big pipe between two
11	buildings requires a professional installation.
12	And the reason I think it requires professional
13	installation is because again, we go back to the
14	cowboy mentality where they buy this equipment, and
15	they juice up the amplifier and so forth, and so
16	on. You have someone who is certified by each
17	manufacturer of using, how to install and
18	understand the equipment.
19	DR. MARCUS: So Kevin certifies the
20	manufacturer. Kevin certifies the installer.
21	MR. FREEMAN: Kevin certifies the
22	installer. He takes a course, or his distributors
23	teach a course all about the product and how to
24	install it.
25	DR. MARCUS: Okay. Vanu was shaking

1	his head about
2	MR. FREEMAN: By the way, that's in the
3	rules.
4	DR. LUCKY: Are you a professional
5	installer? I mean, do you do that stuff?
6	MR. FREEMAN: Not often.
7	DR. MARCUS: Okay. Vanu was shaking
8	his head about that, but also shaking his head
9	about the power on the power limits.
10	DR. BOSE: Yeah, I've got a bunch of
11	things. Yes, on the power numbers, your question
12	was was that the right level adequate? And the
13	simple answer is no, because you don't see any
14	commercial products out there doing anything with
15	that. It's simply not enough.
16	Now I hate to keep harping on the same
17	point, but this goes back to receiver standards.
18	If there were standards so that receiver standards
19	in all the bands have to tolerate a certain amount
20	of background interference, now you could bring in
21	devices, like ultra wideband to start, but other
22	things that sort of operated under the radar, and
23	make that more useful. And we've actually done
24	stuff in the lab at those levels and, you know, you

can transmit a few feet, and there are just not

1	that many applications.
2	DR. MARCUS: Well, most systems above
3	10 to 40 gigahertz, tend to have highly directional
4	antennas.
5	DR. BOSE: Yeah, up above 10, that's a
6	different issue.
7	DR. MARCUS: Well, I mean, but part of
8	the question is, is the number between 10 and 40,
9	should it be 500 microvolts per meter, or should it
10	be lower, should it be higher?
11	DR. BOSE: Well, I think it's a
12	different issue
13	DR. MARCUS: How would you figure it
14	out?
15	DR. BOSE: Well, when you get to 10 and
16	40, when you have such directional transmission, I
17	think that becomes less an issue, because there's
18	less chance of interference.
19	DR. MARCUS: So what number would you
20	write? If you wrote the rules, what number would
21	you write?
22	DR. BOSE: You know, 27 percent.
23	DR. MARCUS: How would we determine
24	what the 27 number is?
25	MR. STEVENSON: In the 24 gigahertz

1	band, the Commission adopted a report and order
2	increasing the field strength from 250 millivolts
3	per meter at 3 meters, to 2,500 millivolts per
4	meter. There was but with a requirement for
5	directional antennas of at least 33 dBi. So the
6	argument there was that the total area encompassed
7	would be smaller, you know, or certainly no more
8	than the lower power with an omni antenna.
9	DR. MARCUS: Well, should we extend
10	that up to 40 gigahertz, or should we keep that
11	only in the 24 gigahertz band?
12	MR. STEVENSON: I think you have to
13	look at what you have to live with there.
14	DR. NEGUS: Well, I would answer yeah,
15	you should. But I think you should across
16	virtually I hate to speak and not think through
17	the consequences on every band, but that concept, I
18	think, applies across every band from DC to
19	daylight.
20	DR. BOSE: Well, not only that. I want
21	to make the point that I think that's something in
22	the spectrum that the Commission should encourage
23	because, you know, if you look at David Reed's
24	

of

all

care

sort

of

taken

25

the

legacy

inefficiencies, and spectrum is pretty fixed and usage increases, we've got to go to more dense lower power transmitters, and this is a way to start encouraging that use, is letting people do more things at lower power under the radar.

MR. STEVENSON: Another point, is not just a question of transmitter could is, power. It's a question of EIRP. For example, in the comments that my company filed, power advocated actually а lower than the Commission ended up adopting but, you know, advocated the use of higher directional antenna gain before you had to start backing off on the transmit power. Because you take advantage of antenna gain at both ends of the link on point-topoint links, and you can end up getting the same margin to a given bit air rate at the same distance with less EIRP. You're discriminating against interfering with systems off to the sides overshoot beyond the intended end-point, so there's more bang for the buck in higher antenna gains, more directive antennas than omni antennas, or low gain antennas and brute force power.

PROF. RAO: I wanted to add a few comments here. I think the antenna issue is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

actually related to the architectural issue. I think .11(b) technologies have been extremely successful at the access level, where you're trying to reach a large number of people. But if you want to build the one level up from there, the back haul so that you can afford to go wireless a longer distance, that is where you start to need more directional antennas.

And to the extent that we feel that there is a need to stimulate and incentivize the development of technologies that will not just work in a single hop, but work multi-hop, I think paying attention to the directionality of the antenna and the kinds of power levels that you're allowed to use, I think will become critical.

MR. LEARY: I really need to defend the professional installer clause for -- with respect to the infrastructure. Two reasons why. Last year, I think the number was 116 people died from tower accidents, the highest number ever. That's one.

Two, I give you an example of a school in the northeast who one day they came back from the weekend, all the water fountain motors were dead. Well, over the weekend they had a lightning

2.5

storm, but the installer who didn't know any
better, grounded to a water pipe. Went down, blew
the motors in these waters fountains. Had a child
been using that while this occurred, the child
would have been likely killed, so in terms of
infrastructure, not on wireless lands, not on
public hot spots, but on legitimate infrastructure
- this is broadband after all, folks. This isn't
some little hobbyist thing. These are providing
critical services to schools, police, fire even in
those occasions, hospitals, and for businesses as
primary connections. You know, it's not some silly
little, cute little niche activity here in the
free-net community. This is real, live, legitimate
infrastructure, and in those environments there
needs to be a stronger professional installer
clause.

DR. BOSE: Well, I'd like a maybe tighter definition of infrastructure there. Let me give you an example. You know, I've got an 802.11 hub in my apartment, and the last time I checked there's seven other people using it for access to the Internet. Am I an infrastructure provider?

MR. LEARY: No, you are not. The last hundred feet is distinctly different from last

1.5

1	mile.
2	DR. deVRIES: So let's assume that
3	Vanu, you know, that a few years from now there's
4	"unlicensed" spectrum lower in the band, where he
5	can, in fact, reach more people, and he's one of a
6	group of people that build out a mesh that cover
7	square miles, is he an infrastructure provider?
8	MR. LEARY: Not in the mesh
9	architecture if it's deployed like that. I'm
10	talking about things specifically deployed on
11	towers, tops of buildings, different
1.2	DR. BOSE: So it seems like you're
13	keyed to power and height.
14	MR. LEARY: I am. It's location-based.
15	DR. BOSE: Okay.
16	MR. LEARY: For example, if it's in
17	your home, single story building, no. But if
18	you're the installer and you're climbing on the
l 9	third floor, and you're mounting something on the
20	outside, so yes, it is location-based in that
21	sense. And I think there's even OSHA elements in
22	that that certainly cross over.
23	DR. BOSE: Well, I guess one sort of
24	example on the boundary is Direct TV dishes. I

climbed out the side of my house and bolted it up

1	there. And, you know, it might not be that
2	lightning proof.
3	DR. MARCUS: Let's ask David Reed.
4	He's been trying to say something here.
5	MR. REED: This is totally outside the
6	technical field, but I would just point out that
7	we're emphasizing the reason that local electrical
8	codes exist, not the reason the FCC exists. And if
9	we really want to regulate people falling off
10	towers, or not getting lightning storms, that's an
11	electrical code issue, not an FCC issue.
12	MR. LEARY: It's the behavior of people
13	as operators in unlicensed spectrum.
14	MR. REED: Oh, sure. But what I'm
15	saying is the
16	MR. LEARY: So, I mean, there is an FCC
17	overlap, and certainly NEC, and OSHA, as well.
18	MR. REED: But NEC is the place to do
19	that, and surely we don't need to have installers
20	worrying about the EIRP in the NEC so, you know, I
21	really think those are totally separable.
22	DR. NEGUS: I think this is analogous
23	to the FCC regulating cell phones while driving. I
24	mean, right? I mean, it's a communications device.
25	People are distracted while driving, and I don't

1 I have no idea what the statistics are, but know. 2 I'm sure it's more than 116 people year in the 3 United States are killed by driving while being distracted on their cell phone. But I don't think 4 that's an appropriate issue for the FCC. 5 6 MR. REED: Yeah. The DOT is worrying 7 about that. It's a fine place for it to be worried about. 8 DR. MARCUS: Okay. We only have two or 9 10 three more minutes to Get away from the go. 11 professional installer issue for a minute, there any other issues that people have that they 12 think are important? Yes. 13 Just one I'd like to make 14 MR. REILLY: is, you know, throughout the discussion today, this 15 morning and both panels, we talked a lot about 16 unlicensed. We've had some discussion of licensed. 17 And I made the point earlier that I think there's 18 lot to be learned from the experience with 19 licensing by rules that took place with regard to 20 Part 15. And we ought to look at opportunities to, 21 in effect, have streamlined licensing processes. 22 And I think that brings up another 23 24 point, which is that there may be a tendency to

unlicensed as

think

about

25

either

to

related

enterprises or residential users, and to think of licensed as perhaps related to carriers or service providers. I think with the kinds of technologies and the capabilities that we're talking about now, it's appropriate, you know, to disassociate technology from who is utilizing it.

there will be opportunities think with the higher frequencies, with regard to more directional antennas, to have distances where a provider may want to operate unlicensed mode between -- to kind of extend a fiber optic system in an environment that might not otherwise be appropriate for bearing fiber. orthere may be, you know, private sector users that are looking to have a licensed operation because they want to put it in, and they want to have the benefits that derive from the rights associated should be licenses, but that process with streamlined so they don't have to wait six months or more in order to get in operation, so that's just a point I'd like to make.

DR. MARCUS: Okay. Let me point out that people who want to give us inputs on certain philosophies of licensed versus unlicensed, in June we issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on 70-80-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

options for the bands on an equal -- at least in the NPRM they're equally treated. We'll obviously probably only adopt one, but one is licensed, one is unlicensed, and one is a band manager, which is sort of in-between. So if people have thoughts and would like to try their thoughts in a specific context, please feel free to send in comments to the NPRM, and it's a much higher frequency, but some of the philosophical issues apply here.

Does this side of the panel have anything to say in the last minute or two?

DR. devries: Just one last comment. We seem to be making the distinction between licensed and unlicensed very clearly. Just to say that to me, the distinction is not that clear, and I expect that as the devices that we build become more intelligent, and some of the futures that are being talked about become real, the distinction will become even more blurred. And as the FCC thinks about these issues, it needs to take a more broad view about the range of possible ways of regulating use of spectrum.

DR. MARCUS: Thank you very much. I'd like to thank the panelists here. I don't want to

rush you, but at 2:00 we're going to have the experimental license panels in the same room with a new cast of people. If you would like to stay here for lunch, let me explain what the arrangements You have to take the elevator up one floor to are. the floor which is oddly labeled CY for courtyard. You can go out the back of the building through security. You have to give them your red badge. They give you a card. Then you have to come in the There are two doors in the courtyard. same door. You have to come in the same one you went out of. There are two restaurants there. If you want to go down 12th Street to the seafood restaurants on the waterfront, they take a little bit longer. There is another cafeteria on the outside, there are actually two on the outside of the building, there are two in the courtyard, and feel free to stay here. And thank you all very much, and thank the panelists for their excellent remarks.

(Off the record 1:03 - 2:07 p.m.)

DR. KOLODZY: Welcome back. Thank you for coming back here. We're ready to get kicked-off the third panel for the day and the final panel on experimental licenses. I'd like to introduce Lauren Van Wazer, who is the special counsel within

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the Office of Engineering and Technology, and also 1 the Deputy Director of the Spectrum Policy Task 2 And I don't think I need to introduce 3 again, but I'll say Bob Lucky, who actually has 4 been co-moderating all three panels today, so I'd 5 like to turn it over to Bob and Lauren. 6 7 MS. VAN WAZER: Thank you, Paul. I'd like to just start down this end, 8 9 and we'll do some introductions. Maybe you could just say -- introduce yourself and say a word or 10 11 two. I am Larry Solomon with 12 MR. SOLOMON: the law firm of Shook, Hardy & Bacon. I've been 13 14 practicing private communications law for longer than I wish to disclose, and have worked on and 15 experimental filed, and processed many 16 17 applications. MR. ROOSA: My name is Paul Roosa. 18 I, too, have been doing this longer 19 with NTIA. than I care to admit but I might anyhow, 1966 I 20 started doing structure management stuff, so I have 21 worked from time to time on our processes of 22 reviewing experimental systems that we call major 23 24 systems. And that's why I'm here.

MR. LYNCH: Hi. I'm Mike Lynch, Nortel

	1
1	Networks. I do spectrum regulatory issues,
2	including experimental licensing, and spectrum
3	allocation issues. And probably one of the reasons
4	I'm here is some of the difficulties there.
5	MS. VAN WAZER: Well, that sounds
6	enticing. Why don't we skip over.
7	MR. HOARTY: I'm Leo Hoarty. I'm the
8	Chief Technical Officer of Dotcast, Incorporated, a
9	technology in Silicon Valley, developing a novel
10	wireless technology. I spent a good part of the
11	last year in these hallowed halls begging before
12	the Commission for experimental licenses, and
13	finally our authorization.
14	MR. HILLIARD: I'm David Hilliard with
15	Wiley, Rein & Fielding, and for more than 25 years
16	I've had the pleasure of working with some of the
17	folks in this room to secure experimental licenses
18	and other forms of approval from the FCC.
19	MR. FRANCA: Hi. I'm Bruce Franca.
20	I'm the Deputy Chief of the Office of Engineering
21	and Technology. I just want to point out that
22	we're in alphabetical order, and this is the
23	separation between me and Paul has nothing to do
24	with our close work together in ultra wideband.

(Laughter.)

1	MR. HILLIARD: I guess I'm glad to hear
2	that.
3	MR. BUCHWALD: Hi. I'm Greg Buchwald
4	with Motorola Labs in Schoenberg, Illinois, and I,
5	of late, have been responsible for obtaining
6	experimental licenses for our beyond 3g activities.
7	MS. VAN WAZER: Thank you. The
8	Commission's experimental license program is
9	supposed to provide manufacturers, inventors, and
10	entrepreneurs with the opportunity to test new
11	radio technologies and new equipment designs, among
12	other things.
13	In 1998, the Commission performed a
14	significant review of our experimental license
15	rules and made lots of changes, including allowing
16	longer license terms. They can be up to five years
17	now, allowing for blanket licensing, allows for
18	STAs without the prior issuance of an experimental
19	license. And also, adding some streamlining rules.
20	I'd like to find out, and particularly
21	since you made a comment that was intriguing. How
22	did we do?
23	MR. LYNCH: Well, essentially when it
24	comes to STAs and things that conform to DOS
25	allocation table, you do very well. But when

you're working on products that are foreign market 1 products, at least our experience has been that it 2 doesn't work so well. I mean, especially when if 3 4 it happens to fall into the DOD arena. And I'll summarize it, it goes to the IRAC and that's it. 5 6 DR. LUCKY: That's it? 7 MR. LYNCH: That's it. DR. LUCKY: You don't get a reply back? 8 9 I mean --MR. LYNCH: You may get a reply, but 10 11 there's no conversation about the reply. If it's negative, it's negative and that's the end of 12 conversation. And I guess my --13 DR. LUCKY: And how often does that 14 15 happen? Well, it's not how often. MR. LYNCH: 16 happen, and it's 17 It's just that it does We had a wireless open loop product 18 frustrating. that we were trying to refine here in the U.S., and 19 it absolutely was not going to be possible to get 20 experimental licensing for it. There was another 21 22 product similar - we understood the controversy on that one. We ended up doing it in a closed loop 23 24 fashion, which is still not the best way to test

our product. But the other one, in particular, was

Ţ	in a band that we told them in the beginning it
2	won't happen, and
3	DR. LUCKY: And it didn't.
4	MR. LYNCH: No, it didn't. Yeah. And
5	it hurt our ability to fine tune and to sell that
6	product as a competitive product for a local loop,
7	for total quality in our local loop.
8	DR. LUCKY: Let me understand. Was
9	that in a military band?
10	MR. LYNCH: 450.
11	DR. LUCKY: What were you doing there?
12	MR. ROOSA: When did it occur?
13	MR. LYNCH: This was probably 1998.
14	MR. ROOSA: 1998. No wonder I couldn't
15	find any records about it this morning.
16	MR. LYNCH: It was a while ago, but it
17	isn't that's sort of well gone, and use it as an
18	example of what can happen. On the other hand,
19	after 9/11, we came in and asked for some stuff in
20	the 1710-1850 proportion for people nodes at Ground
21	Zero, and I think it took about five hours doing
22	OET and NTIA to get the permits out, and get the
23	that worked quite well, but there was an impetus -
24	-
25	MS. VAN WAZER: It's good to get kudos